

### **REMARKS**

In view of the amendments and following remarks, further consideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 35, 38, 40, 43, 46-49 and 51-53 have been amended and Claims 34, 39, 45 and 50 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. It is submitted that no new matter has been added. Accordingly, Claims 35, 38, 40-44, 46-49 and 51-53 are currently pending in this application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph, for insufficient antecedent basis as mentioned in paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office action. By this amendment, each of Claims 51-53 has been amended so as to be dependent on independent Claim 35. Accordingly, it is submitted that the aforementioned rejection has been rendered moot.

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 35, 38, 40 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for the reasons mentioned in paragraphs 6 and 8 on pages 4-6 and 8-10 of the Office action. Without intending to acquiesce to the Examiner's rejection and in order to expedite allowance of this application, each of the independent Claims 35, 38, 40 and 43 has been amended as agreed upon with the Examiner at the personal interview.

No amendment presented herein contains new matter.

### **Substance of the Interview**

An in-person interview was held December 3, 2007 between Examiner Nhon T. Diep and representatives of the applicants as are noted in the Examiner's Interview Summary entered into the Patent Application Information Retrieval database on December 3, 2007. The applicants would like to thank Examiner Diep for conducting the personal interview.

During the interview, Figure 4 of the present application was used as an illustrative example by the applicants' representatives to explain that a transmission apparatus (301) receives an I2C signal sent from a reception apparatus (302), the I2C signal including reception apparatus information which is used by the transmission apparatus to output pictures signals which are displayable in the reception apparatus.

The applicants' representatives explained that the Liu et al. reference (USPN: 5,987,554) fails to disclose or suggest such a feature. Particularly, the Liu et al. reference merely discloses the I2C bus (107) which couples a group of microcontrollers (111 and 112) [see Fig. 1 and Column 3 (lines 19-22)].

As reflected on the interview summary form, agreement was reached with the Examiner that independent claims 35, 38, 40 and 43 as amended herein would be effective for distinguishing such claims over the prior art of record and overcoming the aforementioned rejection.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that each of independent claims 35, 38, 40, and 43, as well as the claims dependent thereon, is clearly allowable and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass the case to issuance.

\*\*\*\*\*

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, applicants believe all of the claims of the present application to be in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and passage to allowance of the application.

If the Examiner believes that contact with applicants' attorney would be advantageous toward the disposition of this case, the Examiner is herein requested to call applicants' representative at the phone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0289.

Application No. 10/088,468  
Amendment dated December 20, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2007

Docket No.: 967\_029

Dated: December 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By Mr S Blasiak

George S. Blasiak

Registration No.: 37,283

**MARJAMA MULDOON BLASIAK & SULLIVAN LLP**

**250 South Clinton Street**

**Suite 300**

**Syracuse, New York 13202**

**(315) 425-9000**

**Customer No. 20874**

GSB/slp